

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Hardin, #275030,)	C.A. #3:08-2334-PMD
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Acting Warden Leroy Cartledge,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that respondent's motion for summary judgment be granted. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with this Court's Order of Reference and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Because petitioner is pro se, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.²

Further, on December 1, 2009, the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts were amended to require a District Court to issue or deny a certificate of

¹Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

²By Order filed on March 29, 2010, petitioner was given an extension of time until May 5, 2010, to file objections to the report and recommendation.

appealability when a final ruling on a habeas petition is issued. The governing law provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debateable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. Therefore, a certificate of appealability is denied.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is **ordered** that respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, petitioner's motion to stay is **DENIED**, and the petition is dismissed.

FURTHER ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

May 11, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina

